



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/661,535

09/15/2003

Hitoshi Hirakawa

122.1568

8025

21171 7590 03/20/2007  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SHERMAN, STEPHEN G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

03/20/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/661,535	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HIRAKAWA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Stephen G. Sherman	<b>Art Unit</b> 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 8 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed the 7 February 2007.  
Claims 1-22 are pending.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 20 recites the limitation "The plasma display device." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2629

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-5 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Correa et al. (EP 1,174,850 A1).

**Regarding claim 1**, Correa et al. disclose a method for driving a plasma display panel, wherein a display field comprises a plurality of successive subfields producing a gradation display, each display subfield comprises at least an address period to write cells to be lit in the display subfield in accordance with corresponding display data and a sustain period to cause light emission to occur in the written cells (Paragraph [0021]), said method comprising:

writing, in the address period of a selected one of the plurality of successive display subfields in each display field, all of the cells to be written in the respective address periods of the plurality of successive display subfields in the display field (Paragraphs [0025]-[0029] explain that the first subfield is used to write all of the cells that are not to be black, i.e. all cells to be written in the display field. The chart at the top of column 6 illustrates this point, since there is a 0 in the first subfield for display data "0" and a 1 in the first subfield for all other display data levels.), and

applying sustain pulses to cause light emission in the respective sustain periods of the successive display subfields of the display field (Paragraph [0021] explains that subfields contain a sustain period to cause light emission.).

**Regarding claim 2**, Correa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 1, wherein the selected display subfield is the display subfield with the lowest luminance ratio (Paragraphs [0027]-[0028].).

**Regarding claim 3**, Correa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 1, wherein a display field has a display subfield with a same luminance ratio as that of the selected display subfield, in addition to selected display subfield (Paragraph [0027] explains that there are 2 subfields with the weight of "1.").

**Regarding claim 4**, Correa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 1, wherein the selected display subfield is the display subfield at the head in a display field (Paragraphs [0027]-[0028].).

**Regarding claim 5**, Correa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 1, wherein an all-cell write discharge is caused to occur in the selected display subfield before the address period (Figure 2, soft-priming occurs before the address period.).

**Regarding claim 19**, Correa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 1, wherein the gradation display level is determined with the luminance due to lighting in the predetermined subfield being taken into

Art Unit: 2629

consideration (The chart on the top of column 6 shows that the luminance takes into account the first subfield.).

**Regarding claim 20**, Awaji disclose a plasma display device comprising a plasma display panel and a driving circuit for the plasma display panel, wherein the driving circuit drives the plasma display panel using the driving methods set forth in claim 1 (Figure 4).

**Regarding claim 21**, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claims 1 and 2.

**Regarding claim 22**, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claims 1 and 4.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 6 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. (EP 1,174,850 A1) in view of Awaji (JP 2000-148085 A).

**Regarding claim 6**, Correa et al. disclose a method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 1, wherein an all-cell write discharge is caused to occur in the selected display subfield before the address period (Figure 2, soft-priming occurs before the address period.).

Correa et al. fails to teach wherein the selected display subfield is also a subfield with a heavy weight of luminance.

Awaji discloses of an all-cell write discharge that occurs in a subfield with a heavy weight of luminance (Paragraph [0017]. The examiner interprets that the largest subfield is the one with the heavy weight of luminance.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of having an all-cell write discharge that occurs in a subfield with a heavy weight of luminance as taught by Awaji with the method of driving a plasma display panel as taught by Correa et al. in order to provide a

Art Unit: 2629

plasma display panel drive method that produces a stable discharge effect while increasing contrast.

**Regarding claim 9**, Correa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 1, wherein the display subfield with the lowest luminance ratio is arranged at the head in a display field (Paragraph [0027].).

Correa et al. fail to teach wherein the selected display subfield is arranged in the second position in the display field.

Awaji discloses wherein the selected display subfield is arranged in the second position in the display field (Drawing 3 and paragraphs [0029]-[0032]. The examiner interprets that since the discharge occurs in sf2, that this is the subfield in the second position and that the display field at the head is the one with the lowest luminance ratio since the sustain period for that subfield is the smallest.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of having the selected display subfield is arranged in the second position in the display field as taught by Awaji with the method of driving a plasma display panel as taught by Correa et al. in order to provide a plasma display panel drive method that produces a stable discharge effect while increasing contrast.

**Regarding claim 10**, Correa et al. and Awaji disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 9.



Awaji also discloses wherein the selected display subfield is one with the second lowest luminance ratio (Drawing 3 and paragraph [0031]. The examiner interprets that since sf2 is in the second position and has the second smallest sustain period that it is the subfield with the second lowest luminance ratio.).

**Regarding claim 11**, Correa et al. and Awaji disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 9.

Correa et al. also disclose wherein an all-cell write discharge is caused to occur in the subfield at the head and the selected display subfield before the address period (Figure 2 shows that soft-priming occurs before the address period in the head subfield.).

10. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. (EP 1,174,850 A1) in view of Tokunaga et al. (US 2003/0067425).

**Regarding claim 7**, Correa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 5.

Correa et al. fail to teach a method wherein the all-cell write discharge is caused to occur twice successively in the selected subfield.

Tokunaga et al. disclose a method for driving a plasma display panel wherein a reset is caused to occur twice in a selected subfield (Figure 18 and paragraph [0158].

$R_{ODD}$  and  $R_{EVE}$  are both reset charges which are each caused to occur in a single subfield.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of having two reset discharges occur in a subfield as taught by Tokunaga et al. with the method taught by Correa et al. in order to provide a display device and a method of driving a display panel which are capable of improving the dark contrast.

***Regarding claim 8***, Correa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 5.

Correa et al. fail to teach a method wherein a display subfield reset discharge is caused to occur in order to erase the residual charges in a lit cell in the display subfield immediately before the display subfield in which the all-cell write discharge is caused to occur.

Tokunaga et al. disclose a method for driving a plasma display panel wherein a display subfield reset discharge is caused to occur in order to erase the residual charges in a lit cell in the display subfield immediately before another display subfield (Figure 18 and paragraph [0158]. The examiner interprets that the erasure stage E is a stage in which a reset discharge is caused to occur in order to erase the residual charges in a lit cell, and that since this occurs in every cell the erasure stage would occur before the predetermined subfield.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of having a reset discharge in a subfield as taught by Tokunaga et al. with the method taught by Correa et al. in order to provide a display device and a method of driving a display panel which are capable of improving the dark contrast.

11. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. (EP 1,174,850 A1) in view of Awaji (JP 2000-148085 A) in view of Tokunaga et al. (US 2003/0067425).

**Regarding claim 12**, Correa et al. and Awaji disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 9.

Correa et al. and Awaji fail to disclose a method wherein a display subfield reset discharge is caused to occur in order to erase the residual charges in a lit cell in the display subfield at the head.

Tokunaga et al. disclose a method for driving a plasma display panel wherein a display subfield reset discharge is caused to occur in order to erase the residual charges in a lit cell in the display subfield at the head (Figure 18 and paragraph [0158]. The examiner interprets that the erasure stage E is a stage in which a reset discharge is caused to occur in order to erase the residual charges in a lit cell, and the E stage is shown to be in the subfield at the head.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of having a reset discharge in a subfield at the head as taught by Tokunaga et al. with the method taught by the combination of Correa et al. and Awaji in order to provide a display device and a method of driving a display panel which are capable of improving the dark contrast.

12. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. (EP 1,174,850 A1) in view of Moon (US 2003/0098826).

***Regarding claim 13,*** Correa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 1.

Correa et al. fail to teach of the method wherein the widths of an address pulse and a scan pulse during the address period in the selected display subfield are wider than those of the address pulse and the scan pulse during the address period in other display subfields.

Moon discloses a method for driving a plasma display panel wherein the widths of an address pulse and a scan pulse during the address period in a display subfield are wider than those of the address pulse and the scan pulse during the address period in other display subfields (Paragraphs [0069]-[0071]. The examiner interprets that since the width of the scan pulses of some scan lines are larger than others and that the data pulses synchronized with the scan pulses are also set to be larger than the scan and

Art Unit: 2629

address pulse applied during an address period would be wider than those in other subfields.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of having wider pulses in the predetermined subfield as taught by Moon with the method taught by Correa et al. in order to allow for the cells to generate high luminance.

13. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. (EP 1,174,850 A1) in view of Hashimoto et al. (US 2001/0017605) and further in view of Tokunaga et al. (JP 2000-276106 A).

**Regarding claim 14**, Correa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 1.

Correa et al. fail to teach a method wherein the voltage of an address pulse during the address period in a subfield is raised.

Hashimoto et al. disclose a method for driving a plasma display panel wherein the voltage of an address pulse during the address period in a subfield is raised (Paragraph [0070]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of raising the voltage of an address pulse as taught by Hashimoto et al. with the method taught by Correa et al. in order to increase writing probability.

Correa et al. and Hashimoto et al. fail to teach a method for driving a plasma display panel wherein the voltage of a pulse in a subfield is larger than the voltage of pulses in the other subfields.

Tokunaga et al. disclose a method for driving a plasma display panel wherein the voltage of a pulse in a subfield is larger than the voltage of pulses in the other subfields (Abstract: Solution. The examiner interprets that since one subfield is indicated as to having a pulse with a larger voltage than the other subfields, that this subfield could be the predetermined subfield.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of having a larger pulse voltage in the predetermined subfield as taught by Tokunaga et al. with the method taught by the combination of Correa et al. and Hashimoto et al. in order to enhance contrast with low power consumption while suppressing a spurious profile also and moreover to enhance display quality by stabilizing selective discharge.

14. Claims 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. (EP 1,174,850 A1) in view of Tokunaga et al. (JP 2000-276106 A).

**Regarding claim 15**, Correa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 1.

Correa et al. fail to teach a method wherein the voltage of a scan pulse during the address period in the selected display subfield is greater than that of the scan pulse during the address period in other display subfields.

Tokunaga et al. disclose a method for driving a plasma display panel wherein the voltage of a scan pulse during the address period in a selected display subfield is greater than that of the scan pulse during the address period in other display subfields (Abstract: Solution. The examiner interprets that since one subfield is indicated as to having a scanning pulse with a larger voltage than the other subfields, that this subfield could be the predetermined subfield.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of having a larger scanning voltage in the predetermined subfield as taught by Tokunaga et al. with the method taught by Correa et al. in order to enhance contrast with low power consumption while suppressing a spurious profile also and moreover to enhance display quality by stabilizing selective discharge.

15. Claims 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. (EP 1,174,850 A1) in view of Kanazawa et al. (US 2001/0054993).

**Regarding claim 16**, Correa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 1.

Correa et al. fail to teach a method for driving a plasma display panel wherein a process to suppress a discharge in an unlit cell is performed between the address period and the sustain period in the selected display subfield.

Kanazawa et al. disclose a method for driving a plasma display panel wherein a process to suppress a discharge in an unlit cell is performed between the address period and the sustain period in a selected display subfield (Figure 17 and paragraphs [0083]-[0084]. The examiner interprets that the voltage applied to generate an auxiliary discharge is a process to suppress a discharge in an unlit cell.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of adding an additional pulse period as taught by Kanazawa et al. with the method for driving a plasma display panel as taught by Correa et al. in order to extinguish a wall charge of a cell in which an erroneous discharge has occurred.

**Regarding claim 17**, Correa et al. and Kanazawa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 16.

Kanazawa et al. also disclose wherein the process to suppress a discharge in an unlit cell is a process in which, at the same time an address pulse is applied to an address electrode (Figure 17, P1 is a pulse applied to the address electrode.), a pulse, the applied voltage of which varies as time elapses, is applied to a scan electrode (Figure 17. The pulse applied during the additional pulse period on X(X2) starts at 0V



the reduces to -50V, therefore the voltage applied during the period varies as time elapses.).

**Regarding claim 18**, Correa et al. and Kanazawa et al. disclose the method for driving a plasma display panel, as set forth in claim 17.

Kanazawa et al. also disclose wherein the final potential of the pulse, the applied voltage of which varies as time elapses (Figure 17, the final potential of the pulse is -50V), is lower than the finally reached potential of a charge control pulse, the applied voltage of which varies as time elapses (Figure 17, the examiner interprets that the pulse applied to the address electrode, which starts at 0V and raises to 50 V, is the charge control pulse, in which the -50V pulse is lower than the 50V pulse.).

### **Conclusion**

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2629

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen G. Sherman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2941. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SS

12 March 2007

AMR A. AWAD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Amr A. Awad', with a large, sweeping flourish extending to the right.